

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-0045-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: n/a

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: NPLD - Blue Lakes Area Clean-Up

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 44 N., R. 28 E., secs. 35 and 36
T. 43 N., R. 28 E., secs. 1 and 2

APPLICANT (if any): BLM

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

The BLM Winnemucca District (WD), in collaboration with partnering groups Friends of Nevada Wilderness, Friends of Black Rock, and Nevada Outdoor School, proposes to hold a National Public Lands Day (NPLD) event on September 20, 2014. The purpose of the event is to engage the public in caring for their public lands. During the event WD BLM staff, partnering groups' staff and volunteers would conduct minimal hiking trail maintenance, road brushing and campground facilities maintenance.

The hiking trail starts at the Blue Lakes threshold at the end of the road cherry-stem. The trail ends at Blue Lakes and the entirety of the trail is located within the Blue Lakes Wilderness Study Area (WSA) and is less than 1 mile. Hiking trail maintenance would include trimming trees that have grown over the trail. Trees that had fallen and were blocking the trail would also be removed. The trail maintenance crew would consist of one BLM staff member, staff members from partnering groups and volunteers. The crew would use hand tools (hand saws and loppers) for vegetation trimming. None of the trail segment is located in Preliminary General Habitat for sage-grouse (PGH).

Road brushing activities would include trimming back trees that had grown over or into the road, starting at the Blue Lakes threshold to Onion Reservoir for a distance of approximately 1 mile (the road itself is 1.5 miles). The road crew would consist of one BLM staff member and volunteers who would use hand saws and loppers to trim back trees. No sage-brush would be cut. The road is a cherry stem road and is not considered to be within the WSA. A small portion of the road is located in PGH.

Campground maintenance would include cleaning restrooms, cleaning out fire pits, removing debris, and painting and updating the kiosk at the campground. A vault 'sweet-

smelling' toilet is located at the Blue Lakes threshold, another on the Onion Reservoir dam, and two are located at the campground. All restrooms all are located outside of the WSA and are not in PPH. The campground team would be comprised of a BLM staff member and partner group members would use a gas-driven pressure washer with Simple Green diluted with water to clean the toilets and walls. The toilets would not be pumped at this time. Water would be brought to the site from the BLM WD office. The campground team also would use shovels and garbage pickers to pick up trash around the restrooms and the campgrounds at the Blue Lakes threshold and Onion Reservoir. Built up ash would be removed from the fire rings at the Blue Lake Threshold and at Onion Reservoir campgrounds with the use of shovels. The kiosk and information board at the Onion Reservoir campground would be painted using latex, outdoor paint with colors that match the existing color. New Leave No Trace® posters and a map of the area would be posted. Fishing regulations that were in place, presumably by the Nevada Department of Wildlife, would be left on the board. A new plexi-glass would be installed to protect posters, map and information.

Part of the recreation area management includes signs. Signs are needed to notify the public of the condition of the roads, which are not maintained. The BLM is proposing to install three new signs stating "Road is Not Maintained, Proceed with Caution". A sign would be placed along Knott Creek Road to Onion Campground, the eastern Shadle Road and the road from Onion Reservoir to the Blue Lakes threshold.

Projects not completed during the NPLD event would be completed after the event based on staff availability, time and funding.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan Date Approved 6/1982

Other document _____ Date Approved _____

Other document _____ Date Approved _____

*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for the following LUP decisions:

See below.

The proposed action in is conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objective, terms, and conditions):

Recreation Objective 1: Promote the understanding of the natural resources in the

Paradise/Denio Resource Area and the role the BLM plays in managing these resources.

Recreation Objective 3: Ensure access to recreation areas for the general public.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name, number and date (DR/FONSI or ROD) all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Recreation Project Plan Picnic Tables, Fire Rings and Outhouses and Environmental Assessment– NV-020-06-16 (5/13/1996)

Pine Forest Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Analysis (9/18/1992)

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. The proposed activities and new signs would be essentially similar to the proposed actions in the Pine Forest Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Analysis (RAMP EA) and the Recreation Project Plan for Picnic Tables, Fire Rings and Outhouses and Environmental Assessment (RPP EA). The RAMP EA analyzed the actual removal of hazardous trees near campground areas and upgrading the road from Onion Valley Reservoir to the Blue Lakes threshold. The proposed activities during the NPLD event of trimming back vegetation from the trail and the road, and removing fallen trees from the trail would be less invasive than the actual removal of trees or upgrading of road.

The RAMP EA and the RPP EA analyzed the installation of the fire rings and restrooms at the camping area around the Onion Valley Reservoir campground and at the Blue Lakes threshold. The RAMP EA also analyzed the installation of the information board at the Onion Valley Reservoir. The proposed cleaning activities and the maintenance of the information board during the NPLD event would be much less invasive.

Litter pick up was identified as an action that did not have an impact and was dismissed from further analysis in the RAMP EA.

The proposed action pertaining to the road signs is similar to the installation of informational signs analyzed in the RAMP EA.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes. The RAMP EA and RPP EA each analyzed a no action alternative. The significance of this area as a potential wilderness area was addressed in each of the EAs. Currently, there is active legislation that may designate the Pine Forest Wilderness Study Area (WSA) as a wilderness area.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes. In April 2010 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service identified the Greater sage-grouse as a candidate species. BLM has developed draft guidance for the protection of Greater sage-grouse habitats. BLM IM 2012-043 and IM 2012-044 provide guidance on how the BLM is to protect sage grouse habitat. The latter IM addresses sage-grouse habitat management in land use plans and is therefore inapplicable here.

Approximately .67 miles of the road from Onion Reservoir to the Blue Lakes threshold is in PGH. The focus of the vegetation trimming would be on the part of the vegetation that had grown over the trail/road. Whole live plants/trees would not be uprooted and only trees that made the trail (not in PGH) impassible would be removed from the trail. Sagebrush would not be cut. All cut vegetation and fallen trees would be left in the area, to the side of the road and trail, in a camouflaged fashion. The project would be outside of critical sage-grouse lekking and nesting periods and would be temporary in nature. The activities would be within the intent of BLM IM 2012-043.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes. The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the NPLD event activities and the placement of the road signs would not exceed the impacts analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. Public outreach was conducted for each EA.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Mark Hall/ Archaeologist/P&EC	Cultural Resources	/s/ Mark E Hall	none 10/30/14
Kathy Cadigan/Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife	/s/ K. Cadigan 10/30/14	
Zwaantje Rorex, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Wilderness	Wilderness Study Area	/s/ Zwaantje Rorex 10/30/14	

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

☒ **Conclusion** *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Zwaantje Rorex
Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Mark E Hall 10/30/14
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ James W Schroeder 10/30/2014
Signature of the Responsible Official Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.